DECLASSIFIED

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 16, 1953

Hallstein called me before [redacted] breakfast this morning to say the Chancellor continued to be [redacted] concerned about the elimination of the famous sentence and if I could give him any information in regard to it today he would be grateful. I talked to Bob Bowie in London about this, then called Jim Conant and later Hallstein. I told Hallstein that Bowie thought it [redacted] inadvisable for the Chancellor to send any personal message to London; [redacted] the American delegation was sympathetically considering his objectives but would have to await a meeting with the other two delegations which would not take place until tonight or tomorrow before reaching a joint conclusion on this matter, which would then be communicated to the Chancellor through the High Commissioner in Germany.

Doug Dillon called me to say he was [redacted] disturbed about the telegram we had sent out yesterday regarding a possible conversation between the Secretary and Bidault. He said he and his staff took issue with some of its conclusions and he himself had sent off last night a telegram at variance with it. He added that he thought we ought to have better liaison on such matters. I agreed with him about the liaison but said I had not yet seen his telegram.

We got hold of the Embassy message and found [redacted] considerable differences between what our two organizations had advocated. Therefore I prepared a memorandum on the subject which I sent to Doug this afternoon. The two telegrams and the memorandum are as follows:

"SENT: Secstate Washington. COLED 65.

"RPTD INFO: HICOG BONN 268
AMEMBASSY LONDON 280

"Re Deptel 1381 October 13 rptd London 1946.

"1. We face real possibility that Laniel Government will evade taking positive steps to bring about EDC ratification in France. Laniel, reversing

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
PREVIEWED BY CEC R DATE 7-1-81
XDS or XDS EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. REASON(S)
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED RELEASABLE
RELEASE DENIED ☐
PA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

previous statements of himself and Bidault, now speaks of bringing EDC to vote only after Presidential election around December 19. Presumably this decision is not unaffected by his own ambition to be President. We have seen no evidence that Government even intends to initiate action to revive work of Assembly Committees on EDC Treaty so that vote could be taken soon after elections. It would be helpful if you could press Bidault to do whatever is necessary to begin active Committee hearings of himself, Pleven, Alphand and other Government representatives. Committee has said it will accept Government guidance in determining its schedule and under best of circumstances process will take some weeks. Bidault should also be pressed to proceed with Saar talks concurrently rpt concurrently with Parliamentary preparations. If we must accept Laniel's decision, goal should be to have everything ready for Assembly vote at latest immediately after Christmas holidays.

"2. General consensus is that if Laniel and Bidault asked for vote on EDC Treaty now they would have majority, and perhaps a respectable majority, assuming Saar settlement, UK association, and EPC progress. This favorable situation could change. As always in France, life of government is in doubt and in any case Laniel Government will most likely follow practice customary during Third Republic of resigning to give new President of Republic opportunity to name Prime Minister. Unless Laniel and Bidault take positive steps before Presidential election we therefore risk being thrown once again into confusion and delay which always attends formation of French Cabinet. Consequently, another French Government through procrastination will have evaded its responsibilities, and horse-trading in forming new Cabinet may make it difficult to obtain commitment from new Government to proceed without attempting to pose new conditions to ratification.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

"3. On European Political Community, it would be helpful if you could inform Bidault of firm view of yourself and the President that development should continue to follow supranational principle. Only in this way can momentum towards developing European unity be maintained and not be defeated by diversion into a mere international organization. You might point out to Bidault that we favor supranational principle not only for its own sake but because we consider it necessary to fulfill condition for EDC ratification contained in French National Assembly Resolution of February 1952 that European Army must be subordinated to supranational political authority with limited but real powers responsible to a directly-elected Assembly. Unless European Political Community is developing on these lines and in particular unless French position in negotiations is consistent with this condition, we do not see how necessary votes from Socialists, Radical Socialists, and even most European of MRP leaders can be obtained for EDC ratification. See COLED 64 repeated London 279 for comments on prevailing confusion as result Quai d'Orsay recalcitrance in obeying Cabinet instructions.

"5. On Saar I talked yesterday with Chancellor in Bonn. He said French seem in no hurry about Saar talks and doubts whether French will even consider discussing any concessions on their part until after Presidential elections. He is, however, going to attempt to work out a basis of discussion with Francois-Poncet after formation of his cabinet next week. As Conant has reported to you, the Chancellor is far from being an independent agent on Saar question and he is also discouraged because in present French domestic political climate he sees little evidence that he will receive any real cooperation from present French Government in pushing forward EDC and EPC despite its stated intentions. BRUCE."

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

"SENT: Amembassy London 292
Secstate Washington 1495

"RPTD INFO: Hicog Bonn 274.

"LONDON FOR THE SECRETARY.

"I would like to make following personal comments on French picture as outlined in Coled 65, which has just come to my attention.

"1. Laniel has consistently told me that he felt EDC would have to wait for Presidential election. There has been no rpt no reversal in his position (see Embtel 1178 of Sept 22). Delay in talks on Saar has merely strengthened position he has always held. Bidault had stated in September that he felt ratification possible during November provided a Saar settlement could be reached around mid-October. That date has not been met due primarily to inability of Adenauer to form a government as rapidly as French had originally considered possible. Bidault has always said that no action could be taken in the three weeks immediately preceding Presidential election, so delay in Saar settlement is now resulting in postponement consideration of EDC until after Presidential election as I indicated it would in Embtel 1339 of October 2. In this connection, I was interested to hear from Teitgen yesterday that, in his opinion, climate in Assembly will be considerably more favorable to EDC after Presidential election than before. He feels that many who hesitate to state their position now because of possible repercussions on Presidential election will then come out publicly in favor of ratification. Incidentally, Teitgen also told me that he now felt that EDC ratification debate should come immediately after Presidential election. He also confirmed optimistic views of Bidault and Laniel re progress they are making with ex-Gaullist deputies. In particular, he felt that Barracin and from 20 to 28 out of 34 members of ARS rpt ARS would vote for

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

ratification. Therefore, while fully realizing risks inherent in waiting until after Presidential election, I feel that in absence of any light on Saar settlement and in view of present political realities, it would be unwise for you to press Bidault to undertake ratification debate prior to the Presidential election. I also feel that your efforts with Bidault would be most productive if they are directed to maintaining momentum which Bidault and Laniel Government have developed. Any indication that we are critical of real efforts that they are now making would, in my opinion, be contraproductive and would give rise to extreme resentment.

"2. Bidault has always indicated readiness to proceed with Saar talks as soon as Adenauer indicates he is ready. It seems to me that the way for Adenauer to advance French action on EDC is to send a definite invitation to Bidault to commence Saar talks. The fundamental reason for lack of progress in France on EDC remains lack of Saar settlement. If Adenauer is no longer able to offer a Saar settlement on the basis hoped for by French after his talks in Paris last spring, I am afraid that we are in for real difficulties with our whole policy of European integration.

"3. I am in full agreement with remarks in para 3 of Coled 65 concerning European Political Community. Bidault has told me that he favors a supranational executive with real powers but with certain definitely limited fields of competence. It would be most helpful if you could find out from him why French delegation at Rome apparently did not carry out his and Cabinet's instructions. DILLON."

"MEMORANDUM TO AMBASSADOR DILLON

"As I told you this morning, I very much regret that our reply to Deptel 1381 was not discussed textually with the Embassy before its despatch. I had only

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

returned to the office at noon yesterday from Bonn and was unaware that it might represent a substantial difference between the Embassy's and my own views regarding EDC ratification procedures. In the future I shall make certain that such lapses do not reoccur.

"However, in preparing this telegram my staff had carefully consulted previous Embassy telegrams and the minutes of the Luxembourg meeting on the subject. These telegrams appear to me to convey, quite properly, information on the various changes of position by French political leaders so characteristic of French politics. For example Embtel 1101 of September 17, 1953, stated that Prime Minister Laniel was determined to secure French ratification of EDC before the end of the year. I believe your remarks in Luxembourg and the Ambassadors' cable from there on September 20 also were to the effect that Laniel and Bidault intended to try to ratify by the end of the year. However Embtel 1178 of September 22 indicated that Laniel now felt that he favored the debate taking place after the elections rather than at an earlier date. This position was confirmed in Embtel 1413 of October 9. Paragraph four of this latter telegram irresistibly led one to the surmise that this decision was not entirely divorced from his own possible ambitions for the Presidency.

"Similarly, Embtel 1090, of September 16 stated that Bidault was convinced France should ratify by the end of the year. I understand from Embtel 1494, October 15, that as the situation developed there has been a change in his judgment as to when the question of ratification should be submitted to Parliament.

"Such inconsistencies and reestimates are inevitable in politics, just as Teitgen's statements to you about the timing of ratification are entirely at variance with his remarks at The Hague a few days earlier that the EDC would be ratified by the French Parliament within a 'matter of weeks,' which personally

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

I thought was an inaccurate and foolish prediction.

"It is in the light of such inconsistencies that I thought the Secretary might well seize upon the London talks to suggest a tangible and important step to Bidault which would not be offensive to the latter and which would not reflect any uncertainty as to the sincerity of his intentions. At the moment, as for some months past, we have of necessity been obliged to take on faith his steadfastness of purpose to 'make Europe,' as well as the domestic political manoeuvers by which he might accomplish this.

"In this connection I feel that the recommendation of the Ambassadors at Luxembourg is still valid: 'Because French hesitations are so widely known and suspected, only public action by present French Cabinet can dispel them. This can be done in a number of ways. Easiest and most effective would be to prevail upon Laniel and Bidault merely to resume process of ratification of EDC Treaty already once started by the French Government, or, failing this, to make an appropriate public statement before any visit by them to the United States. In this way French action would appear as entirely normal and would not be subject to contention that it was dictated by United States.'

"The important and fundamental difference between Coled 65 and Embtel 292 is in the fact that I believe the Secretary should still try to persuade Bidault to initiate immediate hearings in the Assembly Committees (which I understand your Embassy staff believes would take a minimum of five weeks) that are necessary, under French Parliamentary procedures, before a full-dress debate on ratification can occur. In your last telegram you state and I assume quite correctly, that this debate cannot take place until after the Presidential election. However, reporting the Treaty out of Committees and the ratification debate are in a sense independent of each other, except that the timing of the

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

latter is dependent upon the former.

"As to the Saar question, it obviously has to be settled, or else the 'status-quo' maintained. I have always concluded from the Embassy reports that the maintenance of the 'status-quo' would not be satisfactory to the French Parliament and have repeatedly so informed Adenauer. But regardless of when discussion on the Saar takes place, the delay in this regard should not be suffered to postpone the Committee hearings in the French Parliament. By undertaking this Committee work, the present Cabinet can do much to commit any subsequent Cabinet to the EDC, and this action constitutes almost the sole guarantee that in the event the French Government should be changed in composition after the Presidential elections, at least the ability of a new Cabinet to put the question to a Parliamentary vote will not be delayed by an absence of these time-consuming preliminary deliberations.

"These are random observations, but I think may serve to show that the differences between your staff and myself are essentially founded on a misinterpretation of what might be done in preliminary but necessary Parliamentary procedural matters."

Teddy White called on me to discuss prospects for EDC and EPC.

E. and I left on the 6:50 train for Strasbourg.

DECLASSIFIED